

THE RADICAL.

FEBRUARY, 1866.

THE NEW EPOCH IN BELIEF.

BY D. A. WASSON.

IN June, a pine forest might seem to the eye of a careless observer to have been smitten with some disease. The needles turn to a sickly yellow; some fall, having quite perished; some linger, pale and wan, upon the boughs; and all wears the aspect of age and decay. But the sad appearance is deceptive: that which seems death is only a renewal and fresh pulse of life. A closer look will show one that beneath this yellow shroud the young needles are putting forth, green and vivid.

The world is such a forest. Seasons arrive when the old verdure is verdant no longer, when traditional faiths, traditional schemes of social order, grow yellow and sere. Some fall and cover all the earth with autumnal hues; some cling to the places where once they were green and beautiful, but now in greenness and beauty no more. The sight is sad to many, and many there are who mourn over it, like Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted. But a close and hopeful look will show that the heart of man is still young and fresh, and is putting forth a vivid foliage to gladden a new time.

We live in such a period of transition. A double movement is going on — death and birth struggling together, and each conquering on its proper field. The old traditions perish, perish inevitably. It was believed for many and many a century, that certain families were divinely commissioned to rule over nations. That belief is dead. Even where the forms of it remain, the life does not remain. It was believed for many a century that there is a particular institution, to

which, as an institution, the grace of heaven is given first of all ; and that men can obtain it thence only at second hand. But church rule over the human soul ceases ; all over the world it ceases. In some lands it remains as a mere piece of routine, from which the nation cannot free itself ; but even there it is only a dead foliage on the tree of life, which a fresh growth is sure, sooner or later, to push off. It was believed that the whole mind of God, as made known to man, had been put in print and consigned to the bookbinder — that the will and thought of God could be known only by extortion from texts, as the juice is obtained from an orange. But that belief also is dead ; it survives only as a Sunday formula ; in congresses, parliaments, courts, markets, men act from heart and reason, or else from brutal selfishness — from somewhat good or bad in themselves.

The old leaves are yellow on the boughs of human life, even though they have not fallen to strew the earth. Their autumn has come, their winter is near.

Now there are those who find hope for the world only in the restoration of these dying traditions. They go about, as it were, with a paint pot to give back their youthful green to those yellowing leaves. It avails not. To paint them of their first color does not give them back their first life. They are dead, dead.

But though art cannot restore, Nature can and will replace. She has an art above that of paint pot and brush. The roots of humanity strike deep and forever into divine soil : forms of belief die, but the genetic principle of belief survives, works, triumphs, in man's heart ; the principle of belief is deathless ; it has a perpetual youth, and quickly replaces the brown acres of autumn with the green blades of spring. In place of old and outworn despotisms comes an orderly republicanism, more orderly than despotism ever was. In place of a dominating church comes free religious association, warm, earnest, full of promise. In place of text-worship comes a faith in God as forever inspiring the heart of man, and making of that a living Bible.

It is our lot to live in this time of transition, when the world is at once dying and coming anew to life. Our civilization is in process of moulting, losing the grace and consolation of the faith that blessed it of old, but losing only to replace them with a grace fairer and a solace surer.

Connected with this time there are certainly some discomforts. Not every one who is willing to go forward can as yet find his way. For many a one the golden bowl of the ancient faith is broken, the new not yet fashioned ; he thirsts for the waters of life, and his thirst remains unsatisfied. There are those who fear that the modern world

has got "switched off" upon some diverging track, and is daily plunging away farther and farther into the void realms where no fountain sparkles and no sweet herbage grows. To some everything is in question. There are good men in America who sigh for the restoration of monarchy. "The best government I know," said to me a highly cultivated and worthy gentleman of New York, "is the Austrian despotism." There are liberals in religion who return and pledge their fealty to Catholicism. Grown dyspeptic with the strong meat of radical belief, they hasten to those withered breasts, and would fain nurse as adult babies there. In one aspect it is a troublous time.

But is it not also a most hopeful time? Who sees not that out of the heart of the people arises a new faith? Who discerns not the dawn of a new sense of brotherhood? Who does not hear borne upon the four winds of heaven, the melodious breathing of a fresh divine aspiration for noble life? The very pain of the time is due in part to an accession of spiritual force. It is only the living who hunger and thirst. Why is it that so many are no longer content to be selfishly "saved" hereafter? Because there is a new stir of life in their souls; they feel, vaguely but powerfully, the divine meaning of man's existence. Earnest doubt signifies, not an indifference to truth, but a fresh attraction toward it, and a more sacred sense of the obligations it imposes.

Behold this heavenly abhorrence of injustice which has arisen in America. Is that a piece of "skepticism?" It is rather an inspiration. God is with him who so cleaves unto his brother.

This double movement is literally world-wide,—not found in America alone, nor in England, in Europe alone, but under the whole heaven. China, grey with immemorial age, rocks with revolutions and ferments with new ideas. "All civilizations," said a learned and highly intelligent mandarin in San Francisco, "have their seasons of growth, to be followed by seasons of subsidence and decay. China, whose civilization culminated before that of Europe was dreamed of, is now in her lowest estate: yet is already showing premonitions of a new career." The English power in India represents a spiritual hiatus. There too the old ideas have fallen under suspicion; the old institutions no longer represent the spiritual forces which begot them, and are therefore a burden instead of being a support. But India is astir with new thoughts. Denial is there rejecting the old; faith is there preparing the new. The time surely comes when this people, so rich in speculative intellect and epic imagination, will arise in power and beauty, because in belief, once more. Turkey with its

narrower and duller mind, is in the same state, half palsied, half new-born. Russia wars for absolutism, and emancipates her serfs. Italy, the home of the Pope, leads in Europe the movement toward reconstruction on the basis of natural affinity; and her excommunicated king sends a badge of honor to the leader of the new religious philosophy in France. Louis Napoleon, with all his armies at his back, holds his throne only by trimming between the old tendencies and the new. England, the home and fortress of prudent conventionalism, has not a thinker of eminence who does not represent predominantly, though mostly in a cramped and partial way, the modern ideas; and a powerful reaction against obsolete ecclesiasticisms springs up among the very dignitaries of her national church. Finally, in America, he is the popular preacher, as the instance of Henry Ward Beecher abundantly shows, who can put forth the utmost amount of fresh belief, with the least possible exciting of traditional timidities; while the moral and political ideas of Channing, Emerson and Parker have been the inspiration of the nation in the struggles and sufferings through which it has past and is passing. Everywhere is the same spectacle, dying traditions, and a growing faith. Everywhere the world struggles and chafes under the bondage of an institutionalism, that can now only bind and never inspire; everywhere it feels within it the impulse and sacred heat of a fresh believing liberty. Enslaving institutionalism on the one hand; heart and intellect on the other; that is the alternative between which the nations are trying to choose.

This movement has in America ripened more than elsewhere. In many parts of the world it is still in a very immature stage, being little better than a mere uneasiness, a dissatisfaction, a wish, that there were somewhat more worthy to believe and to do. But here, with not a few, the period of transition is past; the desert with its weary wanderings, doubttings, distresses, lies behind; the happy land of sure faith and action stretches fair and near before, or is already in possession. Let me try to indicate briefly the characteristics of this new epoch.

1. The primary departure from the old schemes is found in this discovery, that faith is native to man; born in him, not injected into him; spontaneous rather than artificial; an energy which his spirit puts forth, not a constraint which it passively suffers. This one perception reverses or will reverse, the entire attitude of the world toward the problems of religion and belief. So long as religion was looked upon as a kind of supernatural chloroform, not esthetic, but anæsthetic, and designed to lock up and imprison the powers proper to man's

being
religi
man
he an
hand
it ma
a me
of th
soul
at th
and l
Co
ogy o
belie
alty."
to ac
subm
shoul
your
spirit
Moh
out, u
more
is by
ope i
influe
intell
must
came
Arbit
it mu
of the
Re
here
matte
must
the tv
which
and y
ing t
world
rectio

being, so long the conception of freedom and free development in religion was logically absurd. Considered as a sheer imposition upon man from without, having the right of the policeman over the person he arrests, or the right of the court over the criminal; empowered to handcuff him first, and afterward to bind him over to keep the peace; it made his plea of freedom simply ridiculous. It was, and must be a mere piece of arrest, a putting of man under bonds; and the attempt of the Voltaires to sue out a writ of *habeas corpus*, and restore to the soul its liberties, was regarded, and could only be regarded as a suit at the devil's court, an attempt to overthrow the kingdom of heaven and legalize treason.

Consistently, therefore, with its fundamental notion, the old theology came to man with a fixed scheme of faith, and said, "You must believe this, and just this, neither more nor less than this, under penalty." It could not appeal to his reason and his heart; for that were to acknowledge his freedom and disown its own claim. It could not submit itself to his judgment; for that were as if the policeman should say to the thief, "Walk with me to the lock-up, my good sir, if your judgment approves my invitation." It could not acknowledge a spiritual growth in humanity, it could not see in Brahmsism, Parsism, Mohammedanism, Christianity one self-same native principle working out, under the common laws of man's intelligence, into various forms, more or less perfect; for that cannot be a growth from within, which is by definition an imposition from without; and that cannot develop itself under the common laws of human intelligence and natural influence, which is defined as a subjugation of natural influence and intelligence. It said, "You *must* believe thus and so," because it must say so, or say nothing. It was arbitrary in action because it came as arbiter, and was that or nothing at all; at least nothing good. Arbiter or usurper, autocrat or pretender, policeman or impostor,—it must confess itself one of the two, and must confess itself the worse of the two if it did not assert itself as the better.

Religion as a piece of spontaneity: religion as a piece of arrest;—here we get the two fundamental and opposite forms under which this matter is conceived of. Each of them has its inevitable logic: each must come to a conclusion in accordance with its premise. One of the two must be assumed; either being assumed, consequences follow which no skill can avert and no reluctance long delay. Assume either, and you must read history accordingly; and to read forwards according to the one, is to read backwards according to the other. The world of humanity under arrest, the world of nature a house of correction, with the Hebrew people first, and afterwards their spiritual

descendants released under parole of honor, and then sworn in as special constables, a *posse comitatus* of the Holy Ghost, — that is one way of reading history. The world of humanity under the aspect of free citizenship, and the world of nature its lawful homestead ; each man called upon to develope in freedom his divine resource, and to improve in freedom his natural estate, converting it to spiritual use as he can ; — that is another way of reading history. And accordingly as we read one way or the other, there follows a whole economy of belief, of culture, of social and individual life.

I do not here seek to argue, but only to state. As matter of fact, we the radical believers, have made our election clearly between these two. As matter of fact, the world is making between the two its election ; that is, is changing its choice from one to the other. The new epoch in belief is constituted by the fact that the world is relinquishing the notion of faith as an arrest of natural faculty, a constraint which the spirit of man suffers passively, and is going over to the opposite notion of faith as spontaneous, an energy which man's spirit puts forth, different in its forms, but identical in its essence.

Those who still think, or try to think, religion the policeman of the soul, see in this change something dreadful. Of course they do. To their eyes it can appear only as an attempt at a rescue made by the friends of the criminal. To their eyes the logic that legitimates it is but a Judge McCune issuing a *habeas corpus*, or *habeas spiritum*, to favor rebellion. Of course, I say. A man who looks out of the back window to see what is in front of the house, will not see it. Assuming that the soul is not a free citizen to be furthered, but a culprit to be arrested, they must, they can see in those economies which cherish its liberties, instead of sustaining its incrimination, only irreligion, only treason to heaven. Two opposite points of view cannot give the same results ; and the question here is one of the points of view to be assumed.

If God approaches the intelligence of man only by strong impressions upon the senses, as the old preternaturalism avers, then he who turns his face toward the soul, turns his back on God. If God approaches the will only as an overriding, despotic force, then he who assumes that the divine is to be found in the highest freedom of the will, is stiffening his neck against God. Now, we say that God approaches man, not by that which is lowest in him, the senses, but by that which is highest, the soul : therefore that in turning the face soulward we turn it Godward. And again we say that the divine manifests itself in man by the spontaneity, not by the oppression of his spirit ; by the freedom, not the enslavement of his will, by the utmost

liber
ertie
E
giou
spon
that
shor
Bu
spon
men
Bou
a hu
othe
only
less
mun
gogu
was
bubl
grow
but
With
ange
the
only
dece
2.
epoc
the i
of m
mind
tude
by a
scien
the h
to us
says
force
are ;
you.
idly
harv

liberation and empowering of his being, not by constriction of its liberties and suspension of its powers.

Each of these points of view is, and must be comparatively irreligious to the other. The new epoch has chosen its master word,—spontaneity. It does not complain,—it were puerile to complain,—that the other sees it as irreligious, infidel. As well complain that a shorter man than yourself does not look over your head.

But there is this difference in their regard of each other. Assume spontaneity, and you can still see the old scheme of spiritual enslavement as one of the limited forms of religion. We do not accept Boudhism as a special form of spiritual development, and then raise a hue and cry against Calvinism as if it were merely evil. On the other hand, the adherent of the old notions can see in the new spirit only absolute irreligion. The greater comprehends the less, but the less does not comprehend the greater. The Jewish synagogue excommunicates Spinoza; but Spinoza does not excommunicate the synagogue. The foolish old woman who saw Sir Isaac Newton, when he was excogitating his doctrine of colors, at a window blowing soap-bubbles, was moved with indignation, and declared it a shame that a grown-up man should be wasting the day in such idle child's play; but Newton could not return her indignation, he could only smile. With a like tolerance the new faith listens when the old vents a pious anger against it. It is in the nature of things that the old should see the new as absolutely irreligious; while the new sees the other as only comparatively irreligious, and prepares to make its sepulture decent, or even to speak a kindly word over its grave.

2. As a necessary result of its fundamental principle, the new epoch prefers and favors spontaneous, rather than imitative, belief in the individual. Imitative belief has its place. There are multitudes of men who do their thinking rather by sympathy with some powerful mind, than by an independent activity of intellect. There are multitudes of men who are moral rather by sympathy with custom, or even by a calculating submission to it, than by an original energy of conscience. Nevertheless, original thought and original morality are the high privilege and duty of man. The new epoch calls upon men to use this grand privilege, and to use it in the noblest direction. It says to every man, "Relate yourself to eternal verities by your native force, if you can. Indebted deeply to the past you are, as all of us are; but pay that debt, if you can, by making the future indebted to you. Make history richer for those who shall follow. Instead of idly living upon the grain which the past garnered, sow it, and raise harvest for other times to live upon while they also sow and reap.

Yea, let the past, like a seed, die fruitfully in your souls, that it may come anew and more abundantly to life."

Hence it is assumed that the divine import of life is not merely conserved by the art of the printer and book-binder, but that it is, or should be, coming to light newly and vitally in every age. And moreover, it is a canon of the new time that each generation, each century, is required of heaven to put in use just that light which has come to it in particular. The divine import of life is revealed anew and ever anew in hearts that are really alive; man ever has his root in eternity, his resource in God; and the light given to each age is, with especial emphasis, the light to be used by that age. The mythus of the manna has a meaning for the present day. God of old revealed his truth to his Hebrews; God to-day reveals his truth to his Americans; and what he says especially to us, he especially means that we should attend to.

Would any one ask what God has revealed to his Americans? He has revealed the sacredness of freedom; the divine endowment of every man with rights which society is infidel if it do not respect and guard; the equality of man and woman; the claim of every male and female child to some education at the public charge: the prevalence and indestructibility of order in the universe; the divineness of nature; and underlying all, he is making known that the normal activity of man's spirit involves his own activity,—that a suffusion of the spirit of the universe goes into all effusion from the soul of humanity—that the pulses of progress are heart-beats of eternal Life and Law.

Now, there is not one of the least of these instructions which does not affect the whole aspect and significance of life. The least of them brings a new and pervading element into history, and is like a change in the hue and quality of the blood.

Consider, for example, the truth that has come to us through Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, through the chosen revealers and prophets of science. Set aside the outward uses of science, its enabling the earth to feed a larger population and to feed them better; think only what it has contributed to spiritual impression. Suppose this contribution taken away. Suppose we were this instant to lose our knowledge that the earth is a ball, swinging in space, one of a troop of worlds more numerous than the sands on the seashore, but all arranged in systems moving in harmony, instinct with perfect law; and that we were left to think with men a few centuries ago, that the earth is a flat space of uncertain extent, without fellowship in the universe, that the stars are candles, and the sun a moderate sized ball of fire, going so near the earth, as even Lord Bacon thought, as to burn the

snow off the higher mountain tops. Sweep away from us, I say, this moving, magnificent spectacle of universal order; sweep away the very conception of natural law, which conception is a new birth in the world; make it impossible for our souls to be touched with that religious sense of unity, which now is ours when in the falling of a pebble and the sailing of a star we behold one and the same eternal force and law; landlock us once more within the limits of the horizon, and let us again see in the incidents of nature, not order and everlasting perfection, but at best only celestial caprice; and who will say that we should not lose truth and spiritual impression which reveal God to every eye, and feed and enlarge every soul? Who will deny that all this knowledge is part of that by which our spirits are this day expanded, our hearts this day touched and awed?

Science has its own evangel, such as it is. Not the highest surely; and it runs in the custom of my thought rather to limit than exaggerate its importance.

Again, the faith in freedom, which animates our best minds, I name a true piece of revelation. Is it true that God requires not obedience only, but freedom as the best part of obedience? Is freedom indeed a master-law of earth and heaven? Here and hereafter are we, by the disciplines of mortal existence and the powers of immortal life, to deliver, deliver and ever deliver our souls; and by exalting them into a divine liberty shall we arrive at another and more heavenly order of obedience, which, so far from conflicting with freedom, is its very flower and perfection? The faith in freedom *as divine* means no less. And if it be not divine, away with it. If it run counter to the spiritual destiny of man, who will whisper a syllable in its behalf?

We, the radical believers, have accepted and consecrated the idea of freedom in no trivial spirit. Whither that leads we go; and our journeying is no piece of vagrancy: we walk in faith. And our faith is that God supports, animates, and is revealed by the freedom and spontaneous virtue of the spirit of humanity. We trust that human history is no petty stir on the outside of existence, but that the heart of heaven beats in the heart of man, and that, as Paul said, the eternal works in man to will and to do.

The faith of the new epoch, accordingly, is following God into the future. For it, he is not two thousand years behind, to-morrow to be farther behind, and by each rising and setting sun yet more removed. It doubts not but that the ideas which now stir and glow in the bosom of humanity gather their warmth in the bosom of eternity; thence is their origin, thither their tendency.

Thus our present existence and daily work attain an infinite depth

of meaning. The charm and fascination of the infinite leads us on; its immeasurable solace consoles our fatigues; and we may still rest upon it even in our doubts. With the age of this faith we first see that we are true to heaven in being true to our own souls, — that in thinking our thought and doing our work, we are co-operating with supernal powers, — that in using the light of our day, we are walking by the light of that day on which no sun ever sets, the day without night, — that in sailing by the magnetic needle of the soul we obey no mere private attraction, but give heed to eternal poles and the axis of the Universe. Oh, a faith to live by and die by, sweet, healthful, bracing, vivifying! How it simplifies, while it deepens life! No longer compelled to ransack deserted lands, exhume buried cities, criticise doubtful documents, sift uncertain histories, and do labor for which centuries of learned toil were inadequate, ere we shall know how to live this day and hour, we may even *live*, inwardly assured that the heart of God goes with the heart of man, that the meaning of all days abides in this day, and that in every age the door of truth and duty is a door into the eternal temple, the sanctuary of absolute good.

3. The faith of the new time is characterized by a more exalted and spiritual respect for man's being, a more religious sense of its significance and sanctity. It has been considered an act of piety to speak evil of man. Time was that no prayer was thought complete, or right in tone, unless it were well strown with terms of contempt toward the being of man. The whole rhetoric of reprobation and reproach was lavished on his head. That he is "a worm," "a worm of the dust," was an information vouchsafed to heaven in orisons innumerable. Preachers and devotees vied with each other in inventing terms wherewith to revile him. Dr. South, that great fish-woman of the pulpit, said, that "the heart of a new-born babe is a nest of snakes hid in a dung-heap."

Now, I should no more be at pains to say that the new faith forbears to sully its worship with this pious billingsgate, than I should to assert that my best friend is not a shoplifter. Not to be guilty of these grossnesses is no virtue; it is only freedom from a vice. But it *is* a virtue of the time that there has arisen in it a positive, pervading, daring reverence for the being of man; one which is destined to reform the politics, and write anew the creeds of mankind. It is indeed among the most radical and productive sentiments of modern time. Already it has borne fruit, and more fruit it is yet to bear, in the rescue of oppressed races, in new hopes for buried continents, in the liberalization of institutions, in a higher value set upon human

life. It compels even those who chiefly impugn its sway. Carlyle, so bitterly impressed with the foolishness of multitudes, cannot refuse to these very multitudes his commanding interest ; writing a history of the French Revolution, he gives historical literature a new keynote for all succeeding time, by fixing his main regards, not upon governments, but upon men, not upon dead institutions, but upon the living nation. Slavery has found in this sentiment its one unconquerable opponent. The sense of slavery as a profanation of man's being, was that inspiration which has swelled in noble hearts, and prophesied by persuasive tongues, against it : this it was which added the eloquence of religion to the eloquence of Phillips ; this which lent itself as a grand organ accompaniment to the strong believing simplicity of Garrison ; and it was the reverberation of their words in the nation's heart, the answering echo of this sentiment there, which made even its rage tremulous and timorous before them. It was this, too, which frenzied the South, and compelled it to destroy its own evil hopes by the pre-eminent blunder of civil war ; the rebels took arms in their hands, not less to slay an intrusive faith in their own hearts than to pierce the heart of Northern courage.

This fruitful sentiment pervades the time, I say ; it is in the air ; we breathe it with every respiration ; it is a salt upon the food we eat, and a sweetness in the water we drink. Unacknowledged in the formal instructions of theological schools, held in suspicion on Sundays, blasphemed against by the phraseology of traditional worship, it nevertheless penetrates the theologian, finds access to pulpit and pew, peeps out through the borrowed phrase of prayer : it cannot be suppressed, it cannot be excluded, it will have place, and it will have its way. To a large extent it is indeed crude and impure, a religion, but pagan, sometimes scarcely less pagan than that which it supercedes. Yet crude or clear, derived or confessed, it is a soul of sovereignty, a root of power, an atmosphere of influence in the modern world ; the faith the world really lives by to-day is better expressed by Burns's "A man's a man for a' that," than by all the catechisms, ecclesiastic confessions, and copy-beliefs of Europe and America. It is in Dickens and Thackeray, it is in Channing and Chalmers ; everywhere man, everywhere the native interests of man are set up against the mechanisms of class and creed. Comte confesses it against his own theory that man is but a fragment in Nature : churches confess it against their own dogma, that man is but a combination of snake and dung-heap ; Russia utters it by the voice of her autocrat, and France forces the confession of it from the lips of Louis Napoleon.

And now, at length, this unacknowledged religion of the time is

coming to be acknowledged, and to take its place in the forefront of conscious belief. This it is, more than all else, which makes the new epoch. We are learning *why* man's being has this sanctity. That vital intimacy, that living unison of divine and human, which has been indicated is the old truth which has newly come to recognition ; and no creed will henceforth respond to the felt and moving credence of men, wherein this does not appear as the second grand confession which faith has to make. First, *God is* ; secondly, *God is vitally implicated in man's being*. Hence the universality and perpetuity of revelation ; hence that awful undertone of meaning in all human history ; hence the blasphemy that there is in baseness : hence the infinite, absolute worth of a human soul. It is by reason of this infinite depth of root that the tree of life can tower and spread forever ; the illimitable stretch of immortality is above, because the illimitable resource of God's being is beneath. False to this life man may be, but so far he is not man : false to the eternal soul, he is by the same act, and to the same degree, false to his own. It is only when the fire of eternity gives a spark from its bosom, and then breathes to fan it across the field of time, that the flame is lighted which we name a human soul. True to itself, the soul is true to God ; burning purely, it reveals God ; burying and quenching itself in the sloughs of nature, it denies God. Baseness is blasphemy ; nobility is revelation ; the Pharisee has crucified the Christ in his own heart, ere he crucified it in the person of Jesus. Yea, and to this day that tragedy is repeated whenever any man is false to his soul : while to this day, the Christ rises from his sepulchre whenever a heart that was false to itself begins to be true, whenever through the cerements of sordid life the real life breaks forth, and flames again toward heaven, at once human and divine.

THE LITTLE SONG.

FROM UHLAND.

"WHAT wakens me from slumber,	"Naught do I hear, my darling,
What music sounds so sweet ?	And nothing do I see,
O mother, see, who cometh,	And no one comes a-singing
My midnight hours to greet."	A little song to thee."

"It is no earthly music
That makes my heart so light ;
The angels' songs, — they call me,
O mother dear, good night."

* In
of Oc
found
Grott
wishe
den, I
Meni
them
was h
while
maid
they
sea-k
So er
Su
The
lus ;
much

GROTTA-SAVNGR : THE QUERN-SONG.*

FROM THE ELDER EDDA.

Menia.

Let us to Frothi
Treasures turn —
Happiness out of
The gladdening Quern.
Let him reap riches
And sleep on down !
Let him awaken
To see this ground !

Here there shall no one
Another hurt,
Plotting to evil,
Nor mischief work.
Nor shall the sword-blade
Strike — though one found
His brother's murderer
Lying fast bound.

Fenia and Menia.

But with his first word
Us he did greet
" Ye from your labor
No longer shall sleep

Than the brief silence
The cuckoo doth claim —
No longer than whilst I
Am singing one strain ! "

Fenia.

Frothi, thou wast not
Wonderously wise,
When thralls thou boughtest
To please thine eyes.

Thou boughtest for seeming,
And strength in task ;
But of our ancestry
Nothing didst ask !

* In ancient Denmark — during the reign of Frothi, a direct descendant of Odin — there was a pair of Millstones of such size that no one could be found in the kingdom able to turn them. And this Quern (which was named Grotti), possessed such virtue that it would grind out whatever the grinder wished. It chanced that Frothi, when on a visit to a certain king of Sweden, bought two female slaves of great size and strength, named Fenia and Menia. The king brought the two slaves to the Quern-stones and ordered them to grind out for him riches, peace, prosperity, etc. ; and so avaricious was he that he allowed them rest from their heavy labor no longer than while he could sing one strain, or while the cuckoo was silent. The two maidens sung whilst they ground, and Frothi's people slept ; and, before they ended their lay, they ground out a hostile army against Frothi ; for a sea-king landed there the same night, slew Frothi, and took great spoil. So ended Frothi's peace.

Such is the story of this ancient and very remarkable Icelandic poem. The Grotta-Savngr is as perfect in its development as a tragedy of Æschylus ; and while artistic in construction — differing in this respect from much of the poetry that has come down to us from that rude but intensely

Menia.

Hardy was Hunguir —
 Hardy his sire ;
 Yet was Thiassi
 More stalwart and dire.

Ithi and Arnir —
 Our kin were the twain —
 The mountain-born ettins ;
 Of these we came.

Fenia.

Deep in its dark dell
 It had not been sought —
 Not from its earth-bed
 The Quern-stone brought —

Nor the mountain-ettin
 Maidens the stone
 Thus have turned
 Had their race been known.

Menia.

Playful, weird women,
 We, winters nine,
 Were reared to strength
 In the deep earth-mine.
 Powerful maidens,
 We wrought in our place —
 Moving the mountain
 From off its base.

At the house of the giants,
 The Quern full swift
 We whirled, till the earth-rocks
 Quaked therewith,
 The stone a-rumbling
 With steady stroke
 We kept, till they heard it —
 The underground folk !

Fenia.

But, since, in Sweden
 We bears have fought :

Shields have we riven,
 And red battle wrought.

imaginative people—it has a weird fascination about it peculiar to the poetry of the Northmen.

The two women, whom Frothi had unwittingly bought for ordinary slaves, are discovered to belong to a race of mountain giants. At first they propose to grind out for him those intangible things he had ordered ; but recurring to his harsh treatment of them, and remembering their former wild freedom, they rehearse the story of their ancestry and their achievements in battle, as they turn the ponderous Quern ; whilst under the excitement of the song, their anger kindles more and more against Frothi. The accumulated wrath of this Greek Chorus swells constantly more dire, until at last, the ettin-maidens grind out of the magical mill-stones a tragical fate to Frothi.

As in almost every people's mythological stories, there is a wide application to this old Scandinavian legend. With us, that system which appeared to possess such miraculous power of grinding out unlimited measures of wealth, prosperity, etc. — alas, whilst we slept under the fatal delusion, and trusted that our application of unrequited labor had somehow blinded the sure sight of the gods, this mill-stone of Fate which we had set agoing, ground out a hostile army in our midst which laid waste the land.

Grotta-Savngr : The Quern Song. 207

In direst conflict
The heroes thick fell ;
And we, in the wide land
Were known full well.

We scored with spears
Where the war-cry sounds ;
Wiping our weapons
With blood from wounds.
Now are we toiling
At Frothi's halls ;

Here we are friendless
And held as thralls.

Bitter beneath us
The Earth doth turn ;
And drive we in anguish
An enemy's Quern.
Swiftly the grinding
Hath sped with my hand,
Now my arms shall rest,
And the stone shall stand.

Menia.

Hands may rest not,
Nor cease the round,
Until for Frothi
Enough hath been ground.

Men shall forge them
Swords of might ;
Blood-oozing weapons
For deadly fight.

Fenia.

Awake thou, Frothi !
From slumber long ;
If thou wouldst list
Our prophetic song.
I see a fire burning
Eastward the town ;
The war-heralds waken ;
The light glares round.

O Frothi, no more shalt
Thou hold this throne ;
Nor red rings gleaming ;
Nor palace of stone !
Let us drive, maiden,
Quicker the Quern ;
Or we shall unarmed
In the battle burn.

Menia.

My father's daughter
More furious far
Grinds now, as approaching,
She sees from afar

The deaths of many —
Ah ! Wide flies apart
The bolt of the Quern-eye ! —
Yet let us grind sharp.

With strength the women
Ground as they stood ; —
Ah ! the wild maids
Were in ettin-mood.
The spindle spun wide ;
The hopper off flew ;
And the great nether-millstone

Burst heavy in two ;
But the mountain maidens
Their song prsuue : —
" Frothi, now have we
Thy grist ground good ;
Our grinding is ended —
Full long have we stood ! "

DANGERS OF OUR POLITICAL MACHINERY.

BY JOHN WEISS.

YOU cannot improvise a country by bringing together a number of persons. They must wait till something calls out their manhood and fraternity, till truths become self-conscious within them, and every drop of blood goes to nourish moral resolution, before they have a unity of life.

There is now an opportunity to show our preference of truth to politics, and of the broad popular conscience to the manœuvres of party. We must study how to keep the country up to its enthusiasm for real American ideas, and to protect them against the vices which the old parties used to practise. Unless we do this, the reconstruction of the labor and society of the South, though it may be perfect in phrase, will be badly made, with lingering anxieties and perils of intrigue at every turn. We shall always have a party at the North and South to remember the old political tradition and to recur to shifts which made it so often successful. We are now in a situation to renounce these habits in favor of some form of political action which may more directly and purely embody the true American ideas. We have prevailed by a great majority over disaffection, and we have destroyed the military power of treason. Slavery is in our control, and the whole North is flushed with noble feeling; but we have not reformed the anti-republicanism of our political machinery. It hampers us: it is a danger to be considered beside a slaveholding temper; under certain contingencies I can credit that it might restore the life of slavery. We are thankful to-day for what the country gives us; blessings so solid should increase our care that they may be preserved.

These political dangers to which I allude have four sources: 1st, National and Party Conventions: 2d, the Electoral College: 3d, fraudulent voting: 4th, forced and imperfect Naturalization. All these are hostile to the American Idea, which seeks to express itself politically through the direct, undelegated, unforced and unmixed action of the American people. Let me say something under each of the above heads.

1st. National and Party Conventions for the nomination of President and Vice President. A Congressional Caucus used to undertake this business; the last meeting of this kind was held in 1824: and since that time National Conventions have provided the people with their candidates. The objectionable element in a National Convention, irrespective of the party which may assemble, is, that the people has not delegated power to it, and is not represented by it. It is oligarchical in principle and effect. A few local politicians select delegates, who assemble, not to be instrumental in giving form and expression to the popular desire, but to control it; to present it with the candidate who is regarded by a majority of the delegates as most available. How do these delegates arrive at an opinion on this head?

By not consulting a single popular element, but by consulting cliques, in the caucus, the hotel, and the lobby, after manipulation by partizan agents,

Dangers of our Political Machinery. 209

officers of government or opposition members of Congress. The Constitution of the United States forbids members of Congress and all persons holding office under the Federal Government from being chosen members of the Electoral College: this was to diminish as far as possible the chances for official and partizan influence. But these very men, who cannot be Electors, exercise more than an Electoral power and privilege, by attending National Conventions and mingling with their business. Can anything be more corrupt? The result is that the people receive the dictation of a few interested men, who desire to acquire power or to retain it; frequently a name entirely unexpected by the country receives the ballot which gives a great party its candidate, who then vote blindly as a party and not as sovereign people. What impure motives, what depraved advantages over personal weakness, what appeals to interest, prejudice, sectional pride, what use of wine, of money, of venal promises, make the air of a National Convention unfit to breathe! But it is quite bad enough that availability is consulted instead of the popular tendencies — that an eligible man is mistaken for a man who ought to be elected, and for whom the instinct of the people would fain vote. The people is obliged, at the arbitrary call of a Convention, to trim its instincts to its candidate. It goes into training under the lead of local politicians, so as to be in condition to cast a solid vote, not for the man of their choice, but for the man who happens to come in at the close of a heated balloting. Sometimes two sets of delegates appear, representing not any real popular diversity of feeling, but only local feuds and intrigues. Sometimes half a dozen resolutions wrangle in the committee-room for a place in a platform, not built by a people to sustain its imposing presence before the country, but by stump orators and veteran campaigners to push their candidate through the canvass. What intrigues, what miserable concessions, what flatulency and moral indigestion. A sweet breath from the prairie and the corn-field never strays so far. And home go these asphyxiating bags of wind, to be pressed to the popular lips from numerous stands, till the brain reels with availability. What an utter want of faith in the capacity of the people that is so flattered, and bespattered with fine phrases: as if it had no healthy instincts, and could not, if let alone, run together naturally into great masses of feeling, and great preferences for substantial men. Who can hesitate between the instinct of the people at large, and the instincts which roar and growl in the pen of a National Convention? The popular heart makes its selections of men for any purpose, according to the natural currents which travel, like magnetism, through the air, through the earth and through all bodies. A National Convention is a Leyden Jar which sultrily accumulates, till the unexpected result leaps out and substitutes a spasm for the popular strength. We must trust Nature, and return to her. Our best things in Peace and War are done when we confide in the great elements which find their natural points of congression in human hearts. No machinery nor artificial heat can be a substitute for Nature. The people honors its best generals; it could tell very soon, without the help of a Caucus, the difference between McClellan and Butler and Sheridan. It does not need to have a Convention of delegates inform it

who are its greatest orators, its most practical farmers and merchants, its safest engineers ; slowly but surely it piles up a decision upon these points which ought to be instructive to the subtle but shallow wire-pullers of a party. If it were a question of Art, of Philosophy and Metaphysics, of Marine Insurance, of literary nicety, of scientific truth, I grant that the people is not the right commission to sit upon these things, and its decision would carry no infallibility. But it could rear a President who knew where the joints of slavery lie, and what is the cement of Liberty. It has sometimes been deceived, and may be deceived again if great pains are taken by self-seeking demagogues ; but if let alone, you will find that, "instinct is a great matter." See what it came to in the re-election of Abraham Lincoln, which was no more a result of the Baltimore than it was of the Chicago Convention. Nay, not so much—for when the former could not lead, the latter could alarm. If no Convention had ever sat at Baltimore, the people would have blossomed into Abraham Lincoln by the same overpowering vote. There was a period of six weeks in the summer preceding, when that Convention was prostrate and powerless beneath events. Did the Convention rally? No, the people rallied ; and to elect a man who has represented them more nearly than any President since Washington. And yet the politicians say that the people could not elect a man of the people. A popular majority of 420,000 for a distinctive people's man was the answer. Never go to the people to settle canons of Music, Art and Criticism—to put men at the head of Orchestras, Museums or Finance ; never ask them questions that involve a special culture or a curious knowledge—bid them keep their hands off Philosophy. But if you want a country for such things to thrive in and become illustrious, give to all of them, as God gave the Mariposa Cedars, strong and deep-holding ground, filled with the constituents of symmetry and power.

If the President and Vice President of the United States be elected by an immediate vote of the people, the Electoral College will become superfluous. It is already an aristocratic feature of our Government, cumbrous in its working, and liable to be abused. We know that in 1864, 25,000 votes properly distributed through half a dozen states, would have defeated the manifest will of the people, by throwing the electoral vote of those states for the man who was so pointedly rejected. And if fraud could have accomplished this, it would have been done. What a chance is here for cabal and corruption. And here is another highly instructive calculation, which I find in a number of the New York Independent, published before the last Presidential election. Speaking of the Electoral College, that paper says ;

"Let us see how this machinery works. Were the electors equal in number only to the members of the House of Representatives, the case would not be so bad ; were they thus apportioned and elected as Members of Congress are, singly, there would be a vast improvement. But we add for each state two senatorial or electors at large, thus directly invading the representative system, and giving the smallest states the greatest proportion of power. For instance : in 1860, there were fifteen states—Oregon,

Florida
Vermont
Texas
40,000
entitled
York
This
at the
repres
third
much
more
easily
major
the of
Clella
700,00
Now
would
Union
33 vo
peopl
part b
If
discer
tumult
denti
the el
ple g
tricts
traor
prefe
emnl
the r
day l
tears
But
make
the f
two o
Presi
tives
the p
Nati
well
"S
state

Dangers of our Political Machinery. 211

Florida, Delaware, Kansas, Rhode Island, Minnesota, South Carolina, Vermont, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Mississippi, Louisiana, California, Texas, and Connecticut — having a white population of 3,872,761, only 40,000 more than the single state of New York. These fifteen states were entitled to forty-two members of the House of Representatives, while New York had but 31 — the balance being made up by slave representation. This vast disproportion is bad enough, one would naturally say ; but look at the electoral power. The 15 states named would cast 42 votes for their representatives and 30 for their senators, making 72 votes, or nearly one-third of the whole number in the country, while New York, with nearly as much population, must be content with 33 votes. If anything could be more absurdly anti-democratic, it would be the contingency (which might easily happen) in which these fifteen states should be carried by small majorities, or even pluralities, while the state of New York might vote solid the other way. For instance : the fifteen states respectively choose McClellan electors by, say 100 majority in each state, on an aggregate vote of 700,000 ; that would give McClellan 351,500 votes, to 347,500 for Lincoln. Now suppose Lincoln gets all the votes of New York — say 700,000 ; he would have in the 16 states 1,047,500 votes to 351,500 for McClellan, a Union majority of 696,000. But in the Electoral College Lincoln gets but 33 votes, while McClellan gets 72 — exactly reversing the decision of the people. And this is effected by allowing senatorial electors mainly, and in part by choosing them in lumps rather than on a general ticket."

If the people has discernment enough to vote for electors, does it lack discernment to vote for President ? Would there be a greater danger of tumult and disorder in voting directly for President, than directly for Presidential electors ? If we ever ran the risk of great disorders, it was during the election of last year ; but what a striking proof of self-control the people gave in every town and village ; only in two strongly disaffected districts was there a need to show the ungloved hand of power. Even in extraordinary times, then, it is plain that the people, having sense enough to prefer a candidate, has sense enough to vote for him deliberately, yes, solemnly. The gravity of an Electoral College is stage-play compared with the religious attitude of this nation as it deposited its will at the polls, all day long without a cry, nor a hand uplifted in menace, but frequently with tears, and doubtless with silent prayers before every voting box.

But what if out of three or more candidates, the people directly voting, make no choice ? Then let it directly vote again. In such a case, after the first vote the popular consideration would flow more freely. Voting two or three times in this way would be better than having the choice of President, go as it has already twice gone, into the House of Representatives, where the popular will has to take the chance of being tinkered by the politicians. The House, in such an event, becomes no better than a National Convention. See, too, how undemocratic the provision is ; this is well put in the following statements of the New York Independent :

"Should the election devolve upon the House of Representatives, each state is to have but one vote (to be decided among its members), and a

majority of such votes or states shall elect. For example: In 1860, six states — New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Massachusetts — contained 13,000,000, or half the white population of the Union, and were entitled to 108 representatives and 120 electoral votes. There were six other states — Oregon, Florida, Delaware, Kansas, Rhode Island, and Minnesota — having 672,000 white people, with 8 representatives in Congress and 20 electoral votes. Yet these petty states, in a vote for President of the United States in the House of Representatives, have exactly the same voice as the six great states above named. The 671,000 people scattered here and there in the western wilderness vote down thirteen millions of other people; and, to carry out the illustration on this line, we may select 17 states, having but 53 representatives and but 87 votes in the Electoral College, with less than 5,000,000 of white population, that would elect a President in spite of the fifteen other states, having, in 1860, 188 members in Congress, 218 electoral votes, and 21,000,000 of free white population.*

Let me add, that in case of a direct popular vote, a Vice President would also be chosen upon substantial merits: the people would select him, with the same conscientious care which might go to find a President, to be his fit successor in case of death or resignation: not a third-rate man, balloted for in Convention out of some supposed sectional necessity, to be the presiding officer of the Senate, but a man of mark and capacity, in complete affinity with the President, and not, if the latter dies, to be styled "His Accidency."*

The danger of fraudulent voting is increased by the interposition of State Electors between the people and their choice. Forged names of soldiers judiciously distributed in doubtful districts, with the "marrow-fat ballot" liberally thrown, and Patrick O'Bogus voting 18 separate times for 18 false names, with a rich brogue to them, already entered for him upon the Ward Register, might shift the 36 electoral votes of New York from one side to the other, and convert the tool of a faction into the President of a people. Why should great popular majorities lie at the mercy of State lines in this way? How many local elections have been already decided by the appearance of O'Bogus in 18 characters or more for that occasion only! How closely calculated were these manœuvres at the election of last year: and their failure is only due to the unprecedented uprising of the people. I do not know what local precautions may in the future be invented [to prevent illegal voting: but it is certain that no remedy will be complete that does not abolish all bodies of men that now stand between the people and the object of its will. The mass, directly voting, may counterbalance the frauds which local precautions will never thoroughly anticipate.

Forced naturalization furnishes a great number of illegal votes: but imperfect naturalization that is, a kind that conforms to existing laws but does not really make a man competent to vote, is equally dangerous. It is plain that

* On the operation of the machinery of National Conventions and Electoral Colleges, see "Benton's Thirty Years in the U. S. Senate:" I: 37, 44, 78; II: 204, 591, 625. The Electoral College has been sometimes favorable to true republican ideas; but not from any element of permanent security to them.

reform
the ha
ducted
to nou
for fo
They
party
party
was fo
have l
lander
vocal
grace
He so
the ol
blood
"Am
Amer
of the
Bu
patri
prese
ized
howe
ity a
doers
silenc
cann
uselec
accli
ture
of th
fraud
given
here
altar
to th
one.
deno
tion
that
In c
of re
clar
out,
plac
Nov

Dangers of our Political Machinery. 213

reform is needed here. The Native American movement which fell into the hands of the Know Nothing party, whose schemes were secretly conducted in the spirit of Jesuitism itself, was righteously condemned and came to nought. There was more bigotry than patriotism, more personal dislike for foreigners than regard for American interests, in its leading men. They represented the narrow and vulgar side of the common people. No party in America can prosper that appeals to theological prejudices: no party can live that merely hates the foreigners. The whole of America was foreign two hundred and fifty years ago—all religions and all races have been imported here for the express designs of liberty. The New Englander is very absurd with his stiff and puritanic dislike for people whose vocal peculiarities differ from his own. He really seems to think it is disgraceful for a man to be a German, an Irishman, a Frenchman or a Jew. He seems to be suspicious of the Providence which made them. This is the old English arrogance which the Atlantic has not washed out of the blood. No party can ever retain the sympathy of the people with its cry of "America for Americans," unless it understands that America *makes* Americans of all races, as her climate modifies the plants and the persons of the Old World.

But *how shall America make Americans?* That is a question fit for a patriot to ask. And in some respects the answer must find fault with present laws and regulations. All religions and all races must be Americanized by coming here, whether or not they intended it: not by jealousy, however, and proscription, nor by enactments which are inspired by timidity and exceed the salutary limit. These things will fail, and cover the doers with merited contempt. Religion, manners, and intelligence, must silently improve by contact with all the habits of freedom: that influence cannot be hastened, but it can be retarded by injudicious zeal. Still it is useless to pretend that anything is native to America before it has become acclimated: let it wait, but in the meantime let it not be forced into premature action. Here we must take a decided stand, for we are the stewards of the rights which America offers to mankind. We shall not let ignorance, fraud and passion, endanger one of them, and make them less worthy to be given to the poor and miserable of the earth. Whoever seeks sanctuary here must go through a training before he undertakes to minister at the altar. We ought not to suffer *our own native-born* stupidity and passion to throw a reckless vote. All people are not out of their minority at twenty-one. Suffrage and naturalization must be brought into a closer correspondence with the facts. The 8th Section of the 1st Article of the Constitution defines the powers which clothe Congress: the 4th Clause declares that Congress shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. In conformity with this, an Act of Congress in 1802, fixed a foreigner's term of residence, preliminary to naturalization, at five years: he must also declare his intention to be naturalized two years before this certificate is made out, and he must be resident within the state or territory where this takes place at least one year: and his own oath is not admitted to prove residence. Now if all these conditions were faithfully observed in the cities where emi-

grants chiefly congregate, they would poorly prepare them to exercise the function of voting. They are not carried out — they are shamefully disregarded. Inadequate as they are to make a man an American citizen, they are insufficient to protect the ballot-box from fraud. It is our duty to demand from Congress a more stringent act, embracing certain provisions, which, if they are not carried out must certainly expose the fraud. I would have, for instance, a provision that no man, native or foreign-born should throw a vote unless he can read and write intelligently, the reading and the writing to be tested before a competent authority in the case of every foreigner, and by the grammar school register in the case of every native: if no evidence exists that a native has received the benefit of common schools, he must, whether white or black, submit to the test before the competent authority. And in order to prevent all schemes of naturalization, by new devices of fraud, for the sudden exigencies of party, I would suspend for a man who has been properly naturalized, for one year thereafter, his voting privilege. At present, the children of persons duly naturalized, being under twenty-one years of age at the time when their parents were admitted to citizenship, are, if dwelling in the United States, to be deemed citizens. This also is a bad provision, liable to abuse: for these children, perhaps, have been in the country only five years, with neglected and insufficient schooling. It is doubtful if five years is a sufficiently long probation for the father; but no member of such a family ought to vote till he can read and write intelligently.*

We have talked loosely about suffrage as if it were a natural right. It is not so; it depends upon acquisition, as much as property, knowledge, influence and fame. The right to own one's body and soul, to labor with the hand and brain for the market wages, to exercise faith, conscience, personal religion, to receive personal consideration, to pursue unchallenged personal improvement, — these are natural rights. But the right of suffrage is political. A foreigner has a natural right to have an opportunity to acquire and deserve this political right: but a country can withhold it from him till he has grown up to it. His natural rights in his new country will assist this growth. Abroad, he never would acquire such political consideration: here he must be content to gain it in the country's own method, as he gains her food, her shelter, her refinement.

The phrase "universal suffrage" may be said to indicate the extension of the right of voting to all races and colors. But it is frequently used to include also the idea that universal suffrage should be unconditional, that the *immediate* privilege of voting should invest all races and colors. When it

* The only excellent thing that can be credited to the Know Nothing Party in Massachusetts is the legislative action which secured a reading and writing test for the voter. But the friends of that measure entirely neutralized its benefits by forgetting to provide the means of enforcing it. It becomes immediately obsolete. Unless there is some way by which a man can be challengeable on the day of voting, and some safe expedient for applying the test of intelligence, it is useless to frame statutes relative to suffrage.

Dangers of our Political Machinery. 115

is used with this understanding, it is said that universal suffrage is itself the best preparation of the ignorant and undeveloped for this function of a freeman, and that the attempt to prepare men for voting by education, or to exclude them until they have arrived at some condition of intelligence, is like teaching people to swim by keeping them out of the water. Here is the substitute of a figure for an argument. It presumes that the act of voting upon public questions is the element that instructs men concerning those questions. This converts the ballot into a fetish, and invests it with some magical quality. There is nothing instructive in the act of voting. It is only going to a town-hall and throwing a bit of paper in a box. The Irishmen who are drummed up at elections, and transported at so much a head to the polls, perform this action and depart as sagacious as they came. They will throw another bit of paper on the other political side for the same premium. And all the wrangling upon the steps of the hall lets no perspicuity through their dense ignorance of republicanism. Perhaps they can no more read the votes they throw than the African can read the Arabic charm enclosed within his *gree-gree*, or amulet. Instinct is a great matter when its actions result from the people's common sense, nourished, as it is, by all the American sources of intelligence. This kind of common sense lifts suffrage from a mere act of voting to a deliberate recording of personal opinion, and invests it with dignity, and makes it truly a privilege. It is the kind of privilege that we ought to be eager to extend impartially to every race and color. The moment voting becomes unconditional it ceases to be a privilege. The automatic acts of a machine will never convert it into a citizen : and we might say that as a man cannot swim without water, so his voting action must be through a medium of intelligence.

In a period of renovation we ought not to take our precedents from our defects. The popularity of an indiscriminate voting is the worst argument for its perpetuity in the States which now practise it, and for its extension over other States.

Let us be stringent that we may be just : the Republic deserves the caution of her children. Now that the war has closed, a fresh emigration, stimulated by the prospect of land, wages, labor and personal dignity, will set in. The German will want to own his little patch of soil : the Irishman, less provident, will be seeking opportunities to earn his daily bread. Both of them must wait till the name Democracy cannot bribe or cheat them to vote against America.

SENTENCES OF JOUBERT. *

BY J. B. MARVIN.

THE mind has more thought than memory can retain: it forms more judgments than it knows how to allege motives for; it beholds more laws than it can reach; and it knows more of truth than it can explain.

GOD is in the conscience, but not in our gropings; when we reason we go alone.

To do little things with the highest motives, and to see in the least objects the grandest relations, is the best means for perfecting one's self in wisdom.

CLEAR ideas are useful to the talker; but it is almost always by some undefined ideas, that the soul is served. It is these which direct the life.

Is there anything better than the judgment? Yes: the gift of right, the eye of the spirit, the instinct of penetration, the prompt discernment; finally, the natural sagacity for discerning all that is spiritual.

THERE is a sense in the soul which loves the right, as there is in the body an appetite which loves pleasure.

No one is wise who is not religious.

RELIGION is to the heart what poetry is to the imagination, and what a beautiful metaphysic is to the spirit. It exercises the whole compass of the sensibility.

THOSE who hope know most of providence, and they have a more trustworthy and decided sentiment, than they who fear.

DEVOTION embellishes the soul; especially the souls of the young.

I HAVE an ill opinion of the lion, since I have learned that his step is oblique.

I LOVE more those who render vice amiable, than those who degrade virtue.

RELIGION is the poetry of the heart.

RELIGION is to one his literature and his science; to another, it is his delight and his duty.

THE austere sects are at first most reverent; but tolerant sects have always had most durability.

* JOSEPH JOUBERT, born in Montignac, France, was one of the most beautiful spirits, and noblest thinkers of the last century. He was the pupil of Diderot and D'Alembert, and the intimate friend of Chateaubriand and Fontanes. Matthew Arnold gives a pleasant study of his character in his recent Essays. His works, consisting of *Pensees Essais*, *Maximes et Lettres*, in two volumes, have not yet been translated.

I RESEMBLE in many things the butterfly — like him I love the light ; like him I burn my wings at it ; like him I need, in order to use my wings, that there shall be beauty around me in society, and that my spirit shall feel itself environed, and as it were, penetrated by a delicious atmosphere, that of indulgence ; I need to have friendly aspects shining around me.

GOD is born of God, as the image is produced by the object in the mirror.

It is proper to regret, but it is wrong to laugh at, the religion of others.

CONCEALED perfumes and secret loves betray themselves.

GOD is God : the world a place : matter is an appearance : the body is the mould of the soul : life is a commencement.

TRUTH consists in conceiving or imagining persons and things as God sees them.

THE spirit is a fire of which thought is the flame. Like the flame it tends naturally to rise.

RELIGION prohibits all weakness, and religious weaknesses.

VIRTUE must be sought at any price and with earnestness ; and prosperity modestly and with recognition. To ask is to receive, when we ask for real blessings.

IF it were necessary to choose, I should prefer the mildness which allowed men time to reform, than the severity which rendered them worse, or the haste which would not wait for repentance.

INSTEAD of complaining because the rose has thorns, I felicitate myself because the thorn is surrounded by roses.

WHEN my friends are one-eyed, I look at their profiles.

MEN are accountable for their actions ; but I shall have to render account for my thoughts. They are not only the foundations of my work, but of my life.

THE reason can warn us of that which should be avoided ; the heart only tells us what should be done.

To see the world, is to judge the judges.

ONE is spared from being a tool in society when he is a model there.

HOW many things one says in good faith in conversation, upon a subject which he would not have thought of, had he limited himself to investigating it without speaking of it ! The mind warms itself, and its heat produces that which it would not have produced by its light. Conversation is a source of errors, but also of some truths. Conversation has wings ; it bears one where he would not have gone.

ONE should pride himself upon being reasonable, but not upon having a reason ; he should pride himself upon sincerity, though not upon infallibility.

How can one enter a mind which is full of itself.

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE ON AUTHORITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RADICAL :

MY DEAR SIR : — The criticisms of Dr. Clarke in the Radical for December, on my Discourse entitled "Bond or Free," seem to betray a very careless or at best superficial reading, not only of its statements, but of the general subject. Allow me to make such use of them as may help to a better understanding.

My critic objects to regarding Outward Authority and Inward Freedom as mutually exclusive, and the question between them as the great religious question of the Ages. Defining faith in Authority as merely "a receptive and deferential attitude," essentially similar to that of a truth-seeker towards Comte or Herbert Spencer, and observing that every one has teachers to whom he defers in this way to a greater or less extent, he is right in pronouncing the whole question between *this* Authority and Freedom, to be merely one of 'more and less.' But what then? I may leave Dr. Clarke to settle with the Evangelical world whether this is a fair statement of *its* faith in the Divine Authority of its Christ. I am concerned only to discover what possible bearing the argument can have against a Discourse, in which Authority and Freedom are considered as *opposite principles*. It is of course possible for an unreflecting person to be incapable of perceiving principles at all; but surely no thinker needs to be told that opposite principles are and must be mutually exclusive, whether in matters political or theological.

The question in 'Bond or Free' concerned the *structure of human nature*, considered in relation to certain well known and confessedly antagonistic starting points of belief. It was, as I distinctly defined it, "whether we are so made that we *must* have supernatural or infallible teachers, or whether we are so made that we *cannot* have them;" whether such teachers can or cannot come in from without to supplant by their authority the limitations of the natural faculties and the light of individual reason. *This* is neither 'a mere question of more or less,' nor 'mostly a question of words.' It is no subject for sliding scales or compromises, but demands a categorical Yes or No. And it becomes every one to make distinct answer, and so far as his public influence goes, to present a consistent attitude thereon.

'Must not every one,' asks Dr. Clarke, 'from the Roman Catholic to the extremest Radical, ultimately judge by his own reason?' Unquestionably: and here in order to refute me, he puts his finger just where I would have it, on the very fact to which I was pointing, and which proves what I affirmed. Here Authority and Freedom are taken in accordance with my definition, and *found to differ not as more or less, but as mutually exclusive*. The one is according to human nature, the other is against it. Why, with this Law of Mind upon his lips, he should object to a Discourse which was but another form of stating it, is to me inexplicable, except upon the supposition that he failed to comprehend both the one and the other.

And this is obviously the fact. For his inference from this irrefragable law of mind is that the whole question of Authority, as between the radical

and th
deserv
I m
is by
show
appea
Imagi
failed
most
shift
that it
this ill
satisfac
no m
power
within
himse
antich
either
smoot
tirely
inaccu
and ju
admit
afores
"from
the fa
have,
fallible
that t
differ
the B
follow
escape
unders
To
cate of
belief
conced
harm?
If I
ligious
rather
But
there
Author
Bible a

James Freeman Clarke on Authority. 219

and the orthodox believer, is merely 'verbal, not rational,' and does not deserve to be discussed at all !

I must request my critic to look at this matter a little more carefully. It is by no means a mere question of words, but, as I have endeavored to show in a Discourse in the same number of the Radical in which his letter appeared, a question between Verity and Illusion, between the Real and the Imaginary ; a very serious matter indeed. For Dr. Clarke cannot have failed to observe that while each man must in fact judge by his own reason, most men are under *the illusion*, and a very positive one, that they can shift this perilous function upon some "infallible Outward Authority" : that it is, indeed, the main business of their religious teachers to confirm this illusion, and provide some such imaginary Outward Authority for its satisfaction. And we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that this illusion is no mere verbal profession, or airy nothing on the lips, but a tremendous power in the life ; that it stultifies and perverts this very ultimate judge within, whom we cannot avoid ; that it frames creeds which Dr. Clarke himself regards as harmful, and governs churches which he considers antichristian in spirit ; that it enslaves and persecutes, and leads to no end either of foolish imagination or inhuman conduct. In his eagerness to smooth away differences whose importance he does not appreciate, he entirely overlooks all this, and presents the law of mind in question in a very inaccurate way. From the fact that the reason *must* be the final interpreter and judge, he infers that the Protestant and Catholic really *assert* this, and *admit* that the infallibility of Bible and Church is really lost in that of the aforesaid private interpreter and judge. "They do not differ" he says, "from the radical, as to the criterion of truth." Who does not know that the fact is otherwise ? Both Catholic and Protestant *imagine* that they have, somehow, put the infallible Source of Truth in place of their own fallible reason, which they openly surrender and denounce. They *imagine* that their private limitations are lost in this outward infallibility. They differ *in toto* from the radical as to the criterion of truth. With them it is the Bible and the Church, with him it is the soul. Though both classes follow the same law, the one class are under the illusion that they have escaped it. It is no part of the mental law aforesaid that everybody should understand it, or wisely use it.

To overlook this is, however unintentionally, to make one's self the advocate of moral indifference. It is a difference of false and true principles of belief which we are here told is not worth considering. Are we then to concede that false principles must not be confuted, and that errors do no harm ?

If I went too far in calling such a question as the above the great Religious Question of the Ages, I prefer to err on this side of overestimating, rather than on that of treating it with indifference and contempt.

But Dr. Clarke's confusion goes deeper still. He wishes to prove that there is no *essential* difference of belief between men on this subject of Authority. And here is the argument. The Catholic it is true regards the Bible and the Church as infallible 'Sources.' And the Protestant has the

same notion of the Bible alone. But does not the radical admit that "Christ is a Source"? Does he not necessarily "stand in a receptive attitude" while in his presence, "keeping the critical faculty still, while the apprehending faculty is acting, &c."? All the difference then is that "Orthodoxy regards Christ and the Bible as Sources in a higher sense apparently than they are regarded by the radical." In what this "apparently higher sense" consists, Dr. Clarke does not appear to know, and considers it the defect of 'Bond or Free' that it does not supply his lack of knowledge. I would suggest that the difficulty lies entirely in the fact that he is trying to find a "boundary line" of degree, where the difference is really one of principle. He may come at the squarer of the circle and the inventor of perpetual motion; but who shall show him the boundary line, where fallible authority passes into infallible, and a Source into *the* Source? Dr. Clarke, however, is persuaded that it is but a question of more and less; if somebody would only inform him how much of the fallibility of a Source is to be chipped off to turn it into an infallible one! For myself, I must abide in the conviction that he will only waste valuable time on such questions, and that the sooner the real difference of principle is recognised, "the better for the interests of knowledge."

The true Catholic or Evangelical will be somewhat surprised to hear that the authority of his infallible "Christ" stands in his mind for only a larger amount of that sort of confidence which Dr. Clarke puts in Murray's Guide Book; and that when he renounces the right to question this authority, he is but "holding the critical judgment still, while the apprehending power is acting," only a little more so than the unbeliever! He knows it is a totally different kind of confidence, an absolute and implicit, as the other is a conditional and provisional kind. He does not realize that his own reason is all he has to judge by; but he does know that *the attitude* of his reason is essentially different from that of Dr. Clarke towards his human and therefore fallible, Christ; being determined by the principle that human reason can and must be supplanted by infallible teaching from a supernatural Source, while the other, if it means anything, means the precise negative of this. The individual who goes to Emerson and Thoreau with the same *kind* of confidence with which the Orthodox believer goes to his Christ, exists in an indiscriminating imagination only. There is no sane Theist who does not know that these men are fallible. There is no sane Evangelical who does not believe that his Christ is infallible. Dr. Clarke may act on the postulate that the words of Jesus are to be treated like the words of Plato where they seem to contradict each other. But his Orthodox neighbors act on a postulate which absolutely excludes this. Their 'analogy of faith' requires that Jesus, being infallible, should be somehow found *never* to contradict himself. His 'analogy of faith' requires that Plato, being fallible, should be judged in particular passages as one liable to all the incidents of fallibility. The pleasing words 'analogy of faith' may confuse the simple, but do not touch the root of the matter. *These principles of belief are mutually exclusive.* The radical who goes to the Bible as a Source of Truth, "only not so much as to others," and the Orthodox who goes to

the Bible as *the only* infallible Source of Truth, differ in this ; that they aim in opposite directions, the one at free inquiry into human opinions, the other at entire submission to an unquestionable Word of God. The man who should read the words of Jesus with *the same predisposition* in their favor which he feels towards those of Plato or Parker, (Dr. Clarke's not very alarming test for the radical), and the man who should read them with the *preconviction* that they are infallible, would differ in this, that the one favors his *Author* provisionally, the other accepts his *Autocrat* absolutely. The one principle cannot be applied in the sphere of the other. If Dr. Clarke objects to so many words and illustrations to prove a plain matter, I lament the necessity of using them ; but it is not I who have darkened the plain matter by confounding its terms.

"If the soul may be trusted, then we do not need and cannot have authoritative teachers." This was the statement in 'Bond or Free,' defining authoritative in the usual way, as "*supernatural and infallible*." "Wrong" : protests Dr. Clarke. On the contrary, "we *must* have authoritative, that is, *influential* teachers ; and if we reject (*sic*) Jesus, we shall take Comte or Spencer" ! This is an extraordinary mode of meeting a proposition : to put a sense into it which cannot possibly belong there, and then object that its terms do not hold together !

In reply to such criticism, I have simply to say : It is vain to attempt resolving this question as to the structure of human nature, to which all the great problems of belief go back, into a mere dispute about words. Let the dismal illusion which separates men's hearts and enthrals their reason, and denies the divine therein, be recognized, and fairly, squarely met. I will not apply the term 'manipulation' again, but I will say : Let not the 'Liberal' minister try to smooth the question down, when it comes up among his fellow-teachers, nor to pooh-pooh away their efforts to bring it fairly before the public mind. And do not eviscerate words of their recognized meaning, clap in your own, and then holding up the old shell to the Orthodox or Catholic adversaries, cry, "See how we all agree !" You will lose ground by this kind of strategy in your inevitable controversy with them. Frankly accept the fact of an essential difference in principle between you ; and *then* set forth the law of mind which when once thoroughly understood, may serve to bring you together.

Dr. Clarke is *at heart*, like myself, a radical ; notwithstanding the ingenious fable of the Bee, the Ant and the Spider. My difficulty is not in defending *my Discourse* against his doctrine of authority, but in reconciling the latter with his own position at the Unitarian Convention, and in defending him against *his own Discourse*. I am glad his Letter does not undertake to justify the action of that Convention. Does it justify his own Sermon on that occasion ?

Infallibility proper does not enter into the idea of Jesus as presented in this Letter of Dr. Clarke. He recognizes no authority essentially different from that of the not exactly supernatural Murray, and that of the decidedly human Comte or Spencer. Jesus is *supernatural* in a poetic, not philosophical sense, as one would speak of "lesser masters," like Newton or

others, *only more so*; a mediator like "other inspired men," who are also mediums between Man and God: and *the* mediator, only as having mediated in certain most important matters. Now Dr. Clarke proposed in his Sermon to the Unitarians, a Church Universal and Eternal; and he proposed to build it upon Jesus 'Christ' as its organic, official, divinely appointed Head; "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." Not only are all the terms commonly applied to the official Christ liberally strewn through the Sermon, such as 'the Son,' 'the Saviour,' 'the Master,' 'the One Mediator,' 'Faith in him the one thing needful,' 'the Church the body of Christ,' and the rest:—but as if to make their official meaning clear, the Liberal Christian is informed that it is his duty to teach that "the End in all of God's creation is to bring all His souls to Himself in that great day of judgment, when every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and in earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father; when all things being subject to the Son, and all enemies under his feet, the last rebel obedient and the last sinner penitent, death and hell being both cast into the lake of fire, the Son shall give up the kingdom to the Father, and God be all in all." I will make all possible allowance for poetic ardor and personal affection to Jesus, here. But even then, I must affirm that if words have any positive meaning, the Doctrine of the Letter and the Doctrine of the Sermon are mutually exclusive, and one or the other must go to the ground.

The 'saving essential faith' to which the Sermon of Dr. Clarke invites Catholics, Protestants, religious outlaws and heretics generally, is faith in this *essentially official* Christ. All the noble liberality of certain passages in the sermon pales, while the shadow of this definition falls upon them. It is "at the feet" of *this* Christ that the heretic is invited "to sit." There is not a syllable to imply that there can be any other way of "saving" the soul, but this. When a change of Unitarian base is spoken of, or the carrying of Christ over to the Gentiles, or the heresy of "putting anything between Christ and those he is to save," it is this official Christ that is held in view all the time. 'Thomas Didymus' is to be informed that though he may not believe himself to be saved by "the one mediator," nevertheless this one mediator is with him there, saving him, and "perhaps" is about to "make him one of his apostles." Thus it is idle for Thomas, whose particular objection may be to this very officialism, to pretend that what he wants is a God nearer to him than any historical personage can be.—Nevertheless, I venture to suggest, Thomas may not be so very far astray, after all, in supposing that Unitarians should have something better to do than carrying their mediatorial Christ back and forth like a Hebrew teraph or Catholic Host.

If nothing was meant but that all men should have the loving and devout spirit that was in Jesus, why not say this simply and directly? That would have been consistent with the doctrine that he stands but as a greater among "lesser masters." But it would not have afforded ground for enthroning him, where the Christ of the Sermon was to be enthroned. Here

He is
It is
other
that h
terday
borro
he of
trine
tion t
recon
a 'hu
trodu
impor
But
the o
might
dersta
that t
to be
in "c
as the
claim
But v
It i
pure
prese
set t
put a
And
policy
unkir
feelin
I c
tion o
of de
self a
tive r
now
tions
of the
of tra
eccle
minis
liber
tende
the C

James Freeman Clarke on Authority. 223

He is the centre of the Spiritual Universe, the one vicegerent of salvation. It is the heresy of Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy that "they build up other mediators of creed, church, and *experience* between him and man, so that he ceases to be *the one* mediator." He is "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever." What Dr. Clarke meant by all this language borrowed from the real Orthodox believers in an officializing Christology, he of course best knows; but if it is not wholly inconsistent with the doctrine of his Letter concerning Jesus, then words must surely be an invention to conceal meaning. The 'analogy of faith' does not enable me to reconcile this Christ, of whom the Church Everlasting is 'the Body,' with a 'human Master,' who is *the* mediator only in the sense that he has "introduced," historically, "a certain conviction among men"; no matter how important that conviction may be.

But how were the Unitarians to understand this language, borrowed from the older sects? The true liberals among them were seeking how they might avoid an unbecoming sectarianism. The sermon gave them to understand that the borrowed plumage might be worn without this blame; that the old formulas expressed but the reasonable desire of "the Marys" to be allowed "to sit at the feet of the Master," without taking part in "the disputes of the Marthas." In adopting one of these formulas as their basis of union and condition of communion, the Convention could claim on the authority of Dr. Clarke, that they were perfectly unsectarian. But were they so?

It is certain that, to say nothing of Jews, neither pure Rationalists nor pure Theists, — and there were not a few earnest radicals of this class present at the Convention, — could without violence to their own convictions set their names to the confession of faith there adopted. They could not put a human Master in the place of God, and they were of course excluded. And so I said that partly under Dr. Clarke's *management*, a conservative policy triumphed in the name of a noble liberality. I did not use the word unkindly. I referred to the policy of seeking to create 'an era of good feeling' by smoothing away essential differences of conviction.

I cherish a warm personal regard for Dr. Clarke, and a sincere admiration of his faithful services as a Moral Reformer. It is only in his mode of dealing with questions philosophical and ecclesiastical, that I find myself at issue with him. And observing his misapprehension of representative men like Emerson and Parker, and representative principles like these now under discussion, I must frankly say that the inconsistency of his positions seems to me to result from the conflict between his natural freedom of thought and breadth of sympathy on the one hand, and a certain excess of traditional feeling towards the official Christ of the sects, and love of ecclesiastical organization on the other. His influence over our young ministers has recently been larger than that of any other preacher of the liberal school, and in many respects, deservedly. But is not its prevailing tendency to make them rest in a traditional and imitative virtue? "Join the Church and sit at the feet of Jesus," does not seem to me quite adequate

to express the call of the time to these young men. I would rather he said: "Trust God and follow Him, and Jesus shall be added to you." The Day is more than the Church, and calls for prophets.

An illustration may be taken from this very letter. Dr. Clarke asks if Jesus did not "introduce among men the moral conviction of God's Fatherhood and Man's Brotherhood." I do not understand in what sense any one can be said to "introduce" a moral conviction into the human soul. No one can take such a conviction ready made from another. It is not imported, as are silks and jewelry through a custom house. The most that any teacher can do, is to quicken the natural germs of it, in those around him, to fuller life. *The soul is itself the revelation. Given that, you have all gospels germinant.* It is therefore impossible in the nature of things to put your finger on the moment when a moral conviction appeared in the world; and the attempt to do so for the purpose of proving an exclusive mediation of one person therein is irrational. History, studied as we now study it, teaches nothing more plainly, than that these divine guests elude the search for their origin; and wherever you sound for them, lead back into that tissue of interwoven transmission and inspiration which no man can unravel or fathom, and which no man should attempt to break. Everywhere is some report of them; nowhere the knowledge of their birth. We may loosely say that this or that teacher first taught a certain moral doctrine: but this inaccuracy will not do when we are inquiring seriously how man came by the belief in it. The Religion of Jesus did not drop into history from the sky. Dr. Clarke says it is a law of mind that every one shall have masters. Had Jesus then no masters? The Christianity of Jesus was the outcome of human tendencies: his inspiration new as personal power, but not new as essential truth. Inspiration but expresses what seeks expression in all men: nor shall you measure how far its convictions have already found growth in that natural soil which needed no new elements to bear them. Its existence anywhere is but the pledge that its mark is everywhere. All you can say is that mankind advances in the light and in the use of it.

The theory of importation requires that the conviction should have stood in Jesus in its absolute perfection. How can we affirm this? It is certainly the most difficult problem concerning him to separate what he was from what has been attributed to him by the advancing ages, which have made him the vessel to hold all their wine. Who shall tell us how far what is *now* understood by the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, is consciously affirmed in those instincts of pity for the sinning and the suffering, and of trust in the Divine Care for himself and his true followers, which constitute their meaning in Jesus' Life? It is certain that the passage in the gospels which most distinctly teaches them is a quotation from Isaiah. (Luke iv: 18.) It is certain also that Paul's statements of the Brotherhood of Man are, *as statements*, broader than anything in the gospels, which are as certainly deformed by Judaistic narrowness, here and there attributed to Jesus himself. And Paul owed something to his early culture as well as to Jesus, whom he never saw.

But I do not presume to gauge the sense of divine words, whether ut-

tered
seers
Clar
tion
eth h
child
this
deal
ange
who
learn
toget
ing t
cann
self,
Dr
Mora
of Je
trust
attri
says
H
as b
this
in th
he i
Rom
vers
anci
goo
I
the
do n
God
Hyn
mus
alm
nati
his
the
well
as w
cian
The
the
save
"la

tered by Jew or Gentile. Shall I then disparage the insights of all other seers in order that one alone may be exalted? It is singular that Dr. Clarke should ask where, outside the New Testament, the beliefs in question are to be found. Where then is this written: "Like as a father pitieth his children"? Or this: "How excellent is Thy loving kindness! the children of men shall put their trust under the shadow of Thy wings"? Or this: "Have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us? Why deal we treacherously with one another"? Who called the Lord "slow to anger, father of the fatherless, nigh to all that call upon Him in truth"? Or who predicted that nations should beat their swords into ploughshares, and learn war no more? Shall we ignore our debt to the Hebrew? Can we altogether deny the claim he puts in, that except myths and dogmas concerning the official authority of Jesus, there is nothing in Christian belief which cannot be found in Hebrew teaching? On what, according to Jesus himself, hang all the law and the prophets?

Dr. Clarke admits that the Spirituality and Sovereignty of God, the great Moral Laws, and the Progress of the Soul, were recognized before the time of Jesus. Does he suppose that these could be realized without infusion of trust in God as a Father, of love to men as brothers? Do we come at one attribute of Deity at a time, or at one human relation at a time? "Never," says Schiller, "appear the immortals, never alone."

He does not find God represented as the Universal Father, and all men as brothers anywhere in the Ethnic Religions, and thinks we may infer from this that 'Christ is the one Mediator of these truths.' Does he reflect that in thus claiming for Christianity the exclusive origination of its principles, he invalidates its claim to be the Universal and Absolute Religion? The Roman Catholic is wiser, in basing certitude, as he claims to do, on "universality, antiquity, the agreement of mankind." "Nothing should be *more ancient* for man," says even Cicero, "than that justice, which looks to the good of men."

I cannot but hope that I have been more fortunate than Dr. Clarke in the search for these beliefs. It is needless as well as impossible here to do more than hint at a few instances. I find the Universal Fatherhood of God in the Socrates of Xenophon, in the Hymn of Cleanthes, and in the Hymn of Aratus, quoted by Paul in his appeal to the Athenians: in Maximus Tyrius and Simplicius, in Manilius, Epictetus, Seneca, Cicero. I find almost every Greek or Roman poet from Hesiod and Homer down, designating Jupiter as the Father of Gods and men, and drawing the inference of his universal care. I find Philo declaring all men brothers by virtue of the inspiration of the Eternal Word. The Golden Rule belongs to Hillel as well as to Jesus: 'Forgive if you would be forgiven,' to the Son of Sirach as well as to the Son of Joseph. The boundless philanthropy of the Confucian ethics points clearly to a foundation in the early religion of China. The Avesta teaches in the name of the supreme God, that the sinners at the Last Judgment shall condemn the righteous man because he did not save them. I find a real instinct of universal brotherhood in the Buddhist "law of grace for all," propagated through Asia with an unequalled energy,

and a democratic love the more intense for the depth of that radical misery which it saw in all existence. I find the orator Quintilian continually appealing to the sentiments of compassion and brotherly love, as the noblest in man, and 'as uniting all men by the will of the Common Father.' I find Cicero over and over again affirming that men are "*created for the purpose of mutual help*," and that "one man should never be unfriendly to another, for the simple reason that he is a man." I know not where I should end, if I should undertake to quote what Cicero, Epictetus, Aurelius and Seneca have said of the common citizenship and brotherhood of men. I believe most thoroughly with Saisset, that Stoicism "anticipated Christianity in the recognition that men are brothers and brothers in God." It is difficult to see how any student of Roman civilization at the beginning of the Christian Era can doubt that the universality of spirit attained by the new faith was largely due to the influence of Roman Law, Philosophy, Philanthropy and Piety. Need I refer Dr. Clarke to the concessions of early Christian Fathers concerning the wisdom of the Heathen, or to the statement of the orthodox Merivale, that "while the apostles preached the commandment of Jesus that he who loveth God love his brother also, the same instinct and sympathy *sprang spontaneously, and without a sanction but that of nature*, in many a (heathen) watcher of the wants and miseries of men"? Let me say in general, what I hope one day to prove more fully, that I find all through the Oriental Religions vigorous germs of these great natural beliefs, quite adequate to *guarantee* their fullest expansion in Christianity. It is easy to point out inadequacies and inconsistencies in these earlier confessions. But the assumption I oppose is not that the convictions in question were more purely conceived, and more grandly lived by Jesus than by the others; but that they are so exclusively *his* that he may properly be called the "one mediator" of them between God and Man. This phraseology seems to me quite unworthy the free thought and scholarship of this time and this country. If Christianity is to be our religion, it must be founded in nature, not on the absurdity of a gospel appealing to no human experience, a teacher declaiming in an unknown tongue. In this I am sure Dr. Clarke will agree with me. But some of his positions almost imply such absurdity.

The question does not depend on historical testimonies. What if we could not find one teacher who had lisped of these eternal verities before Jesus and Paul? The inference of Dr. Clarke would not be justified. Truth is not bound to come only through the 'mediation' of the man who may have first uttered it, nor of the man who may have best lived it. Essentially, it comes in others *as it came in him*. Education and Inspiration; Past and Present; God, the Soul and the World;—these, its Eternal Factors, abide for all.

SAMUEL JOHNSON.

AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.

SECOND GENERAL MEETING.

THIS body, which held its first general meeting on the 4th of October last, opened its second general meeting in the hall of the Lowell Institute in Boston, on Wednesday, the 27th of December, 1865, at 10, A. M.

Prayer having been offered by Rev. Dr. Neale, of Boston, the records of the previous meeting were read. From these it appeared that the officers of the Association, as at present serving, are the following :

PRESIDENT.—Prof. William B. Rogers, 1 Temple Place, Boston.

VICE PRESIDENTS.—1. Rev. Thomas Hill, D. D., Harvard College, Cambridge; 2. Charles E. Buckingham, M. D., 911 Washington Street, Boston; 3. Hon. George S. Boutwell, M. C., Groton, Mass.; 4. Francis Lieber, L. L. D., 48 East 34th Street, New York.

DIRECTORS.—1. Rev. E. O. Haven, D. D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; 2. Mrs. Mary Eliot Parkman, 109 Boylston Street, Boston; 3. David A. Wells, Esq., Custom House, New York; 4. Hon. Emory Washburn, Cambridge; 5. Mrs. Caroline Healy Dall, 70 Warren Avenue, Boston.

GENERAL SECRETARIES.—1. Samuel Eliot, L. L. D., 30 Chestnut Street, Boston; 2. F. B. Sanborn, Esq., 12 State House, Boston.

SPECIAL SECRETARIES.—1. Hon. Joseph White, Williamstown, Mass.; 2. James C. White, M. D., 10 Park Place, Boston; 3. Hon. George Walker, Springfield, Mass.; 4. Prof. Theodore W. Dwight, Columbia College, New York.

TREASURER.—James J. Higginson, Esq., 40 State Street, Boston.

The chair was occupied by the President, PROFESSOR ROGERS, who called on the Recording Secretary to bring forward any business which might come before the meeting.

Mr. Sanborn, the Secretary, then read a list of Honorary and Corresponding Members, which had been agreed on by the Executive Committee. The Honorary members, residing in America, were the following :

Dr. E. Sayre, New York; Samuel B. Ruggles, Esq., New York; Henry Barnard, L. L. D., Hartford; A. Bronson Alcott, Esq., Concord; Rev. Frederic N. Knapp, Yonkers, N. Y.; Prof. Daniel Wilson, Toronto, C. W.; Edward A. Meredith, Esq., Quebec, C. E.; Rev. Philip Carpenter, Montreal, C. E.

To these were afterwards added, Henry C. Carey, Esq., Philadelphia; Charles L. Brace, Esq., N. Y.

The Corresponding Members, residing in Europe, were the following :

In Great Britain and Ireland,—The Right Honorable Lord Brougham, George W. Hastings, Esq., John Stuart Mill, Esq., M. P., Thomas Hughes, Esq., London; Miss Mary Carpenter, Bristol; Matthew Davenport Hill, Esq., Birmingham; Sir Walter Crofton, Winchester; Edward Peacock, Esq., Botsford Manor; Lord Radstock, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, Edward Chadwick, Esq. C. B., Edwin Lankester, M. D., William Farre, M. D. F. R. S., Hon. Edward Twistleton, Prof. J. E. Cairnes, London; Captain J. M. Whitty, James P. Organ, Esq., Dublin; Sir John Bowring, Exeter; Prof. Henry B. Rogers, Glasgow.

In France,—M. Bonneville de Marsangy, Paris; M. F. A. Demetry, Mettray;

M. A. de Gasparin, Paris; M. Gustave de Felice, Montauban; M. Edward Laboulaye, Paris.

In Belgium, — Hon. Henry S. Sanford, U. S. Minister, M. Edward Ducpetiaux, Brussels.

In Prussia, — Baron Franz Von Holtzendorff, Berlin.

In Italy, — Signor Martino Beltrani Scalia, Turin.

In Russia, — M. J. Kapnist, St. Petersburg.

The name of Lord Brougham was objected to by Mr. G. H. Snelling and Mr. Capen, on account of his expressions in regard to America. A discussion followed, which was closed by a brief speech of the President, deprecating any rejection of members on account of their opinions, and reminding the association of the life-long services of Lord Brougham in the cause of human improvement. The list was then adopted by the meeting, the names of Messrs. Kapnist and Laboulaye having been inserted at the suggestion of Rev. C. F. Barnard.

The Executive Committee, through the recording secretary, then proposed a by-law allowing the Executive Committee of the several departments to hold meetings of their departments at any time and place they may choose. This was adopted by the meeting.

The President then addressed the association, calling attention to the objects of investigation, and showing the practical connection between all the physical sciences, and what is called "Social Science." Professor Rogers spoke with great force and clearness, and was applauded by the audience.

The subject of Education was then brought forward by Dr. Hill, the President of Harvard College, and Vice President of this department. His address related to Problems in Education, and was full of interesting observations on the subject.

At 12 o'clock the chair was taken by Dr. Charles E. Buckingham, Vice President of the department of Public Health; and Mrs. Dall, one of the directors, presented a report on the subject of a Library devoted to Social Science. This lady stated that there was great difficulty in America, in obtaining works of authority on such questions; that the Boston Public Library contained a small collection of such works, but still very insufficient; and that it is very desirable to raise money and purchase such a Library to facilitate the operations of the Social Science association. Mrs. Dall spoke with earnestness on this point, and closed by stating the desire of the Association to welcome women as members, and to receive suggestions and papers from them.

Dr. Buckingham then laid before the Association certain questions which the Executive Committee of the department of Public Health had proposed for discussion in the coming year. There are six in number, as follows:

1. Quarantine, considered in its relation to Cholera.
- * 2. The Tenement House; its economical and healthful arrangements, and how by legal means, to provide for the latter.
3. The present method of drug inspection in the United States.
4. Pork, and the diseases in man caused by its use as an article of food.

American Social Science Association. 229

5. A system of sewerage applicable to large inland cities, and intended to promote health in the future, as well as economy in the present.

6. The adulteration of milk.

Dr. Buckingham then read a paper by Dr. A. B. Palmer, on "Sanitary Education," in which was given an interesting scheme of lectures on sanitary matters which have been commenced in the University of Michigan during the past year.

Dr. Palmer's paper gave a general view of the subject treated, fortified with illustrations and statistics. At the conclusion of this paper, a little past one o'clock, the association adjourned.

At the opening of the afternoon session, Henry C. Carey, Esq., of Philadelphia, read a paper on "our National Resources." Mr. Carey began by contrasting the countries in which capital commands a high rate of interest, with those in which the rate of interest is low. He then dwelt on the importance of bringing the producer and consumer near together, and thus avoiding the "petrification of capital," as he phrased it. He spoke of the waste of capital and resources in America, giving several illustrations of this. He commented on the neglect of our mineral wealth, on the cost of the tariff of 1846, which he estimated at 6,000,000,000 a year for a long period. He contrasted the paralysis of labor during Mr. Buchanan's administration, with the extraordinary activity of the four or five years of war. The cause of this change was, in his opinion, the increased rapidity of circulation of the products of industry, and the tariff of 1861. He gave several illustrations of his statement that our products had been enormously increasing during the past few years. In a brief review of the industrial history of the United States for half a century, he spoke of the effect of successive tariffs, ascribing the prosperity of the country to a protective policy, or what he called, "National Free Trade," in opposition to "British monopoly." The views of Mr. Carey, while strongly favoring protection, were ably stated and clearly illustrated, and commanded the close attention of the audience, who applauded heartily at the close of the paper.

E. H. Derby, Esq., of Boston, followed Mr. Carey, directing his remarks to the importance of the New England fisheries, and the Reciprocity Treaty with the British Provinces, which he hoped would be renewed. He dwelt on the antiquity of our fisheries, on their value pecuniarily, and as a school for seamen, and spoke eloquently of the services rendered by the Massachusetts fishermen to the country in the Revolution, in 1812, and in the late rebellion.

John L. Hayes, Esq., of Boston, added his testimony to the importance of the Reciprocity Treaty, which he trusted would be renewed. He believed its advantages were mainly on the side of the United States, although both parties were gainers.

At the close of the remarks of Mr. Hayes, the association adjourned to 10-30 A. M., on Thursday, December 28th.

The session was opened by a paper from F. B. Sanborn, the Recording Secretary, on Prison Discipline in Europe and America. Mr. Sanborn spoke of the Irish Convict System, and of its real founder, Captain Macon-

ochie, who, however, had no direct connection with the establishment of the Work System in Ireland under Sir Walter Crofton. Portions of two letters from Captain Maconochie to Horace Mann in 1846, were read, in which an account was given of the state of affairs at Norfolk Island, before and after 1840, when Captain Maconochie was sent to take command there. These letters, which have been published, are of great interest. A brief account of the working of the Irish system since 1854 was then given, and extracts were read from a letter of Captain Whitty the present chief of the Irish prisons, in which the present condition of these persons was stated. Mr. Sanborn concluded with some account of the movement for a reformed prison discipline in America, which has been commenced within the past two years.*

The second paper was read by Dr. Ray of Providence, on the Isolation of the Insane, in which it was stated that the imprisonment of the sane in asylums rarely if ever takes place, either in this country or in England,—Mr. Charles Reade to the contrary, notwithstanding. Dr. Ray also presented, with the needful explanations, a project of a law for the regulation of Insane Asylums and Hospitals. The whole paper was admirable, and was well received by the association.

Professor W. P. Atkinson next read a paper on the English Civil Service Examinations, in which that subject was fully discussed. He was followed by Charles L. Brace, Esq., of New York, who read a most interesting paper on the Sanitary Legislation of England, fortified by statistics and by the results of his own observation during a recent visit to England.

In the afternoon session of Thursday, Dr. Edward Jarvis of Dorchester, read a paper on the Duration of Human Life, in which he touched upon the subject which Mr. Brace had treated, drawing from the same statistics inferences of another kind, of no less importance. This was the last paper read; but a communication was laid before the association on the Eight Hour System in Australia, and some discussion was had in regard to the paper of Mr. Carey.

After speeches from Professor Rogers, Judge Washburn and other members of the association, the meeting adjourned at 4 P. M. on the 28th.

It was the general opinion of all who attended the sessions, that the association had begun its labors with great spirit and in a very interesting manner. It is understood that the proceedings of the October and December meetings, together with the papers read, will soon be published in a small volume for the convenience of the members. We venture to say that this volume will contain much that the general public will wish to read. s.

* This paper was very full and valuable, and we are glad that it will be printed for the service of the public.—ED.

Wh
Mary
ject
a mos
is the
Unita
self fo
wome
instan
the pr
was t
which
The
which
system
Germ
been
Irelan
is mor
other
vitudo
Ticke
Patro
Organ
of Tr
and ha
of the
law of
Crofto
where
We
System
A syn
setts
ument
origina
Wh
tences
amoun
for Ca
pil of
his be
1840, t
South
applica
chie ha
est, as
detaile
not the

* On
Boston

BOOK NOTICES.

MISS CARPENTER ON PRISONS.*

WHEN Lord Brougham in his late address at Sheffield, spoke of Miss Mary Carpenter, as having written the "fullest account of the whole subject" of English and Irish Prisons, he paid a most deserved compliment to a most deserving laborer in the cause of Social Science. Mary Carpenter is the daughter of Dr. Lant Carpenter, well known as one of the leading Unitarian clergymen in England thirty years ago; and she has given herself for so many years to the study of Crime, especially among children and women, that she may well be reckoned a high authority. In the present instance she has written of a matter which concerns Americans greatly; for the present state of Prison Reform among us, when compared with what it was twenty years ago, is such as to make us blush for the indifference with which we have viewed a momentous subject.

There is scarcely a country in Europe, not excepting Spain and Greece, which has not within the last fifteen years materially improved its prison system, while ours is probably worse than in 1850. In Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy and Portugal, the changes have been many, and the general improvement very marked. In England and Ireland, however, a fundamental change of system has been adopted, which is more important to the world than any of the ameliorations introduced in other countries. We refer to the introduction of what is called *Penal Servitude*, with its concomitants, the *Work System* of Captain Maconochie, the *Ticket of Leave*, the *Intermediate Prisons* of Sir Walter Crofton, and the *Patronage of Discharged Convicts*, best illustrated by the labors of Mr. Organ of Dublin. *Penal Servitude* takes the place of the vicious methods of Transportation and Prison Ships, which are now definitely abolished, and has been enforced, under conditions the most favorable to reformation of the criminal, in Ireland alone. But by virtue of certain changes in the law of England, made in 1864, the favorable conditions which Sir Walter Crofton instituted in Ireland, are now being introduced in England also, where Sir Walter himself now lives.

We cannot here go into the details of the world-renowned *Irish Convict System*, for which we must refer our readers to Miss Carpenter's book. A synopsis of it may also be found in the *Special Reports* of the Massachusetts Board of State Charities, (Senate Document No. 78, and Public Document No. 19, Supplementary, 1865.) But we must say a word of the real originator of the new Prison System, ALEXANDER MACONOCHIE.

When in 1832-4, Archbishop Whately suggested to Earl Grey, that sentences should be imposed on criminals, not for *time*, but for a certain amount of work to be done, he made a happy statement, which it was left for Captain Maconochie to verify and illustrate. This veteran sailor, the pupil of Nelson and Cochrane, the companion of Sir John Franklin, has won his best laurels in the reformation of rogues. Sent by Lord John Russel in 1840, to take charge of the humble convict depot of Norfolk Island in the South Sea, he converted it into an orderly and moral community by the application of the principle which Whately had laid down, but which Maconochie had also developed for himself. The story is one of the deepest interest, as is the whole career of Maconochie. This too, our readers will find detailed in "Our Convicts," although the later labors of the old Captain are not there dwelt upon at any length. He was for a while the Governor of the

* OUR CONVICTS. By MARY CARPENTER. London: Longman's. 1864.
Boston: W. V. Spencer, 138 Washington Street. 1865.

Birmingham Gaol, and is said to figure as one of the heroes of Charles Reade's "Never to Late to Mend."

The *Work System* is the work of Captain Maconochie, whose theory of it contains several things which have not yet been put in practice in Ireland or elsewhere. But Sir Walter Crofton, who in 1854 took up the work which Maconochie had begun, has shown in Ireland, and is showing at the Winchester goal in England, how valuable an aid it is in the reformation of criminals. On this subject, and on many others, Miss Carpenter's book is an Encyclopedia of facts and arguments. It lacks methodical arrangement, and what is an indispensable part of such a book — an Index; but it will repay the reader for a complete perusal, which will alone disclose how rich it is.

AN EXAMINATION OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY, AND OF THE PRINCIPAL PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS DISCUSSED IN HIS WRITINGS. By JOHN STUART MILL. In two volumes. Boston: William V. Spencer. 1865.

EXTREME transcendentalism, and the opposite metaphysic of Mr. Mill are alike attempts to produce offspring from a single parent. One would obtain knowledge solely from within, the other solely from without; while in truth knowledge is the joint product of native mental resource and sensible experience. Transcendentalism elects the masculine term, and has accordingly a virile and genetic force, which it is exhilarating to see; while Mr. Mill's system places the mind in a purely feminine attitude without doing justice to it in that position; for he concedes to it no vital, gestatory power, but only an ability to take in and arrange what comes from without, as furniture is taken into a house, and set in order.

The cardinal doctrines of Mr. Mill are, that there is nothing higher than knowledge, and that knowledge is no more than the sum and correlation of our sensitive experience, shed out and extended by inference. To what straits this drives him is suggested more than sufficiently by the fact that he declares our inability to conceive of a round square, or of an object at once wholly white and wholly black, due merely to the accident of our never having seen a round square or such a white-black object! We have no right, he says, to declare this *Yes* — No, impossible. In other words, for aught we know, the shortest distance between two given points may be also, and in the same sense, *not* the shortest distance! To absorb all the sun's rays without reflecting any, may, for aught we know, be compatible with reflecting all his rays without absorbing any! Mr. Mill is a brave man, and toes the mark in every instance; but what to say of a system which pushes a powerful intelligence to confusions and imbecilities like these?

The pursuit of metaphysic, at least in its present state, is a very poor employment; yet a treatise upon this subject which should rescue it from one-sidedness, and do justice to man's mind while recognizing its relation to man's sensible experience, would render a service to our century which it were not easy to surpass; and perhaps some one of us, who sees, (or at least thinks he sees,) the way out of the present imbroglio, should constrain his inclination, and set about this work. If only matters of immediate practical interest did not press upon us all with such tyrannical urgency!

As a criticism upon Sir William Hamilton's colossal confusion, and upon the orthodox atheism of Mr. Mansel, the present work is above praise. Mr. Mansel, in particular, is crushed like a mosquito by the sharp *spat* of a man's hand. Yet the moment Mr. Mill comes to construction, he is trying to make one side of a roof stand alone — an enterprise which not even his vast ability can redeem from ridicule.

D. A. W.